

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

## **MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Lee Carroll’s *pro se* Motion (Doc. 94) for a reduction of his criminal sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and United States Sentencing Guidelines Manual (hereinafter “U.S.S.G.”) § 1B1.10. The Court appointed counsel for Carroll, and said counsel has since moved to withdraw on the basis that she can make no non-frivolous arguments in support of Carroll’s request. (*See* Doc. 99); *see also Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967). Despite the allowance of a response period by this Court (*see* Doc. 101), Carroll did not respond to defense counsel’s motion. Meanwhile, the Government filed a Response (Doc. 104) that agreed with the basic assertions and relief sought by defense counsel.

Carroll pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to distribute 5 grams or more of a mixture containing crack cocaine. At sentencing, the Court found by a preponderance of the evidence that Carroll's relevant conduct was at least 150 grams but not more than 500 grams of crack cocaine, which under U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1 yielded a base offense level of 34. His offense level was reduced by three points under U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1 for acceptance of responsibility. However, the Court found that Carroll was a career offender under U.S.S.G. § 4B1.1 based on prior drug or violent felony convictions, which raised his offense level to 37, again reduced by 3 to 34 for

acceptance of responsibility. Considering Carroll's criminal history category of VI, established by his career offender status under U.S.S.G. § 4B1.1, this yielded a sentencing range of 262 to 327 months in prison. The Court imposed a sentence of 262 months. Carroll now asks the Court to apply recent changes to U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1 to lower his sentence.

Section 3582(c)(2) allows the Court to reduce a defendant's previously imposed sentence where "a defendant . . . has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(o)." In doing so, the Court must consider the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) and must ensure that any reduction "is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission." 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) (2006). Thus, a defendant urging a sentence reduction under § 3582(c)(2) must satisfy two criteria: (1) the Sentencing Commission must have lowered the applicable guideline sentencing range, and (2) the reduction must be consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission. If the defendant cannot satisfy the first criterion, the Court has no subject matter jurisdiction to consider any reduction request. *United States v. Lawrence*, 535 F.3d 631, 637-38 (7th Cir. 2008); *see United States v. Forman*, 553 F.3d 585, 588 (7th Cir. 2008), *cert. denied sub nom. McKnight v. United States*, 129 S. Ct. 1924 (2009).

Carroll cannot satisfy the first criterion because he was not "sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(o)." 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) (2006). Amendments 706 and 711 amended U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(c) as of November 1, 2007, to lower by two points the base offense levels associated with various amounts of crack cocaine. The Sentencing Commission

amended U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(c) intending to alter the disparity in sentences involving crack cocaine and sentences involving powder cocaine. Carroll, however, was sentenced based on his base offense level set forth in U.S.S.G. § 4B1.1, not his base offense level set forth in U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1. *See Forman*, 553 F.3d at 589-90. Thus, his guideline range has not been lowered, and he cannot satisfy the first criterion under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) for obtaining a sentence reduction.

Because Carroll cannot satisfy the first criterion under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) for obtaining a sentence reduction, the Court does not have subject matter jurisdiction to consider his reduction request. *See Forman*, 553 F.3d at 588; *Lawrence*, 535 F.3d at 637-38. The Court therefore **GRANTS** counsel's Motion (Doc. 99) to withdraw and **DISMISSES** Carroll's *pro se* Motion (Doc. 94) for a sentence reduction for lack of jurisdiction.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to mail a copy of this Memorandum and Order to Lee Carroll, Reg. #05052-025, FMC Lexington, Federal Medical Center, P.O. Box 14500, Lexington, KY 40512.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.  
DATED: March 1, 2010**

s/ J. Phil Gilbert  
**J. PHIL GILBERT**  
**DISTRICT JUDGE**